P.F. 104 of 93

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-92

~~192~~ .

(LR)

File No. 131 of 91

Serial Nos. 1 - 9

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 9

Major ~~Part~~ B for March 94

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Dasappa regarding the Shanbhogi of Dinamaghattanahalli and Narasimhana halli in Goribidanur Taluk

Submitted

Considered

WD 2283—GPB—20,000—14-6-26

Heard go to Narasapha, and allen
made of Respt. — But the Dy Comr
in 1889
ordered the Shanbhoge of all the 3
villages to be registered in the
name of the Respt, & to leave the
registry of Patach undisturbed. — The
appeal is against the order. —
~~The appellant appeals against the order~~ The
table of the genealogy of the family is given bel

Gundappa

Shamanna	Chikka samanna	Narasapha alive 1272	Dasa alive 57
Lakshmanappa Respt 57	Ramappa 40		

The Dy Comr gives no reason whatever for
accepting the amicable settlement made
by the parties. —

6

10

8

M No 202 of 1891-92

Appt
Dasappa
of Honkere
Gumbadanere
Taluq
Holur Dt
represented by her
Srinivasaiyyer
advocate

Respt
Lakshmanamma the
widow represented by
her Narayanrao
advocate.

Appellant & Respt II are members of
family related as shown below. — (Gonappa
deceased)

Gonappa

ina	Chikka Shamana	Nanappa alive
Gunappa alive	Rama Chappa alive	Dasappa Appt

order the Decree. The Decree

the name of the Respt, &
that the Patriarchs officers
Shews may remain tho they
leave. The Dr Court
has not given her reasons
for not complying with
the request of the parties
& the Respt is now unable
to show cause why their
amicable settlement
should not be carried out.
but from the Records it appears
that Respts Mother
presented a Petition to the Dr Court
on 7th March stating that the Khanboje
right of Panchayet settlement was
acquired by her husband &
that this Khanboje right of all
the Villages should be registered
in the name of herself & her sons
son — Probably the Dr. Court
did not wish to go into the
matter & simply gave the
order as passed The Respt

13

is entitled to show that he has exclusive right to occupy of the Offices or not that he pays rent or any of it when he gives his consent. Leave therefore directed that the offices be registered in the names of the Revenue Parties according to their settlement viz 1889. If they desire to dispute his claim he may assert it in due course.

24/2/92

Appl is referred to Dy Com[r]
No orders have been issued pending the appl to appeal



Copies of Papers to be prepared by Dispensa Keeper, of Ramanna Rajadurga Nayak of Kundapur Taluk, who was Manager of Ramanna Gonsalves Estate, and of Lakshmi Ramanna Gonsalves Estate, Manager of the Lakshmi Ramanna Gonsalves Estate.

Certificate of Ramanna was the Reg... Office of Clerk of Kundapur Division Collector and Assistant Collector. After the death of Ramanna, the Manager, who was succeeded by Lakshmi Ramanna, continued in office till 1888 when the said Lakshmi Ramanna died and Lakshmi Ramanna and Joseph Gonsalves Lakshmi Ramanna took office.

On the 28th January of the Lakshmi a petition of the widow for Letters stating that she continued to perform the duties of Manager through the Regr. of Deeds. But subsequently, stating, considering continuing any longer manager some misappropriation of the funds of the Estate, consequently they were compelled, with the consent of their Counsel and to avoid any with the Petitioner stated they have resigned to the office of Manager and Petitioner, since resigned

the immoveable property of the deceased and
bequeathed and requested Executors thereto.

On the 2nd day of the said Testator's last
took down the depositions of Catherine Macauley
Executrix, Executor and Executor.
One and all of them declared the following
instrument produced by them and requested
that the same may be duly registered.
The Municipality of Caledon Village to Catherine
Macauley and Executor Executrix.
The Collector's Roll of the Township of Caledon
for the County of Peel, was returned
to the office in 1852.
The Collector's Roll of Chinguacousy and
Toronto Gore - to Executrix.
The Municipality of Chinguacousy and
Toronto Gore - to Executrix.

On the 6th February 89 the Executrix with
her two Sureties Executed the Bond as well
as an Inventory of the Goods, Chattels & the
Deceased from Municipality, Collector's Roll
for Township of Chinguacousy and Toronto Gore
Municipality returned Collectors Roll of Caledon
Municipality, Collectors Roll of Executrix
Family.

On the 9th March 89 the Deposition
signed in the Petition dated 25th that, as from
the records Examined by the Registrar
for the Office of Municipality of the Village,
the Deceased Catherine Macauley Caledon
to the Petition and Executor the Petition of the Executrix by
Executrix by Examination of the Petitioner
and the Executrix and Witnesses that
they were personally informed that the said

Could not be found within the Records
Established was read -

On the 30th April 89 the Commissioners
-ed that papers were found & Petition
the Name of Catherine Maxfield stated
and praying to be informed who should
be registered for the Office of Solicitors
and Barristers at Law.

On the 2 May 89 the Commissioners
directed the Clerk to report in what manner
the above Officers registered, and if he was
doing his duly that occasion was there for
a change.

On the 6th June 89 the Clerk reported
that Isaac Greene was registered for the
Office of Solicitor & Barrister at Law, that
he was doing his duly, that Charles Adams
Son Samuel Greene & Isaac Greene were registered
to the Office of Solicitor & Barrister and that duly
being performed by the said Isaac and
that he having attained the Majority Samuel
Greene was called to take the Oath from the Register
himself and that was the only Change
needed.

On the 2nd July 89 the Commissioners
ordered that if Register Isaac Greene
was fit to Practice he may be taken from
him -

On April 89 petitions Isaac Greene
-mitted a petition to the Commissioners praying
for the Cancellation of his Register
Catherine Maxfield as Attorney at Law

Hen Village. His Worship the Chairman and Gentlemen
composing the Council.

Vide last former and this day's minutes this No 220
of 31-8-93.

Humbly sheweth that Petitioner and other persons
applied for a copy of the above order as well
as for a copy of the Inquisition report in the
case and on the 5th Inst. Petitioner
forwarded a petition praying for the early
final disposal of the said matter - Petitioner
begs to state that the above persons were duly served with notice to appear
before the Council early this present and
that the Petitioner was duly served with notice
of the 5th Inst. - after some correspondence
between Petitioner and the Clerk to the Council
Petitioner was informed that the Inquisition
report was not available, the Copy applied
for was prepared and duly forwarded with
Dy. Commissioners No. 635 of 16th Inst. for
delivery to Petitioner - the petitioner took
the copy on the 17th Inst. and forwarded a
receipt therefor. But he was not furnished
copy of the Inquisition report.

Vide — do —

On the 5th Instant the petitioner duly
submitted his petition requesting that his
previous petition regarding the Encroachment
of Kadiri and other Villages was taken into
consideration and prayed that it may be disposed
as all the Ryotwars.

On the 17th Instant the Dy. Commissioner
forwarded with his petition dated 5th Inst
his Inquisition report and the above petitioner
the petition was returned with the Dy.
Commissioners letter dated 16th Inst. No. 635 of
the 17th Inst. But this was not received by
Petitioner and consequently

Vide — do. —

3

On the 29th August the petitioner did not appear and there was no one present on his behalf. Letters of Administration pendente lite were granted to the petitioner.

On the 4th October the petitioner submitted copy of Medical Certificate dated 29th August 1890 certifying that the petitioner was suffering from Peritonitis and was therefore unable to attend Court on the hearing of the petition.

Upon the petitioner writing to the Registrar requesting information as to the following points

1. The petitioner replied that the petition was prepared and that the petitioner on 29th & 30th August and 2nd Sept. were the days the petition was received in the Registrar's office and that the petitioner was present on the hearing of the petition.

2. That the petitioner personally in the Registrar's office and that the petitioner personally executed the petition and that no one else was authorized by the petitioner to sign the petition on his behalf apart from the petitioner's Counsel of.

That the reason why the petition was not prepared in the Registrar's office was

dated 9th March 89

On the 7th June 93 the petitioner again submitted a reminder praying for the early disposal of the case. This was also sent to the Dy. Commissioner on 4th July 93 in continuation of the previous reference sent to him in the August and the petitioner was informed personally that the Dy. Commissioner was asked for further information in the case and that a reminder was sent to him on the 9th and that on the receipt of the information called for his case would be disposed of.

On the 22nd July 93 the petitioner again submitted a reminder which was forwarded to the Dy. Commissioner on 8th August 93.

On the 31 August 93 ~~the Dy. Commissioner~~ the Dy. Commissioner in forwarding the information called for, submitted with his No. $\frac{780}{200}$ a list showing the petitions received from the petitioner at his office and the action taken on each of them as well as the records connected with the case and explains the remaining points called for.

RK

The real order appealed against is dated 9 March 1889, & the Revenue Code was introduced on 1st April 1889. So, the provisions of the Code do not apply to this case. —

Admit the Petition & give notice to parties & fix a date for hearing.

[signature]
19/12/93

8

M No 202 of 1891-92

Appt
Dasappa
of Renkere
Gumbidaner
Taluq
Kolar Dt
represented by his
L. Srinivasayyer
advocate

Respt
Lakshmanaswamappa
represented by
his Narayanaswamy
advocate

Appellant & Respt 1st & 2nd are members of
one family related as shewn below.

Gowdappa

Shamana	Chikka shamana	Nossappa alive	Dasappa Appt
Lakshmi narayanappa Respt	Gowdappa alive	Rama chandrappa alive	

The family has
Shanbhoji right in 3
villages & Patailki right
in 2 Villages - The
Shanbhoji stood in the
name of Respt & the
Patailki in the names of
the Appt & Shikkasamma.
On the death of Respt's
father, the parties
agreed among themselves in January 1889
that the offices should
be distributed as shewn
below: ——— & applied for regd accordingly

Pmt

Appt	Shanbhogi of Dimmagaum & Narasamkambalu	Potagi	48
Respt	Do of Kenkere		57
Nanjundaiah	Patali of Kenkere		40
Narasaiah	Do of Narasimhalli		12½

But the Dy Com issued
an order on 9th March 1889
that the Shanbhogi right of ace
the 3 villages should be as

(1) Petition duly stamped

(2) Copy of Order produced.

(3). The Order is dated 9.3.89, but the petitioner pleads that no notice was given to his pleader on 9.3.89 4.8.90 8.11.91, and he was told at last on 14.2.92 that the former Dy Comrs Order could not be altered and that the petitioner must appeal.

Calculating from the date of the alleged verbal Order of 14.2.92, the appeal is in time

(4) Rule I, CC.(1) of the Addl. Rules

Submitted to the Council

2/5/92

Ascertain from the Dy Comr the allegations made in para 4 of the Petn are correct

11/5/92

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 .

No. 1295

Name of Petitioner. Vaidyan Moothan alias Sivaramma Vaidyathiri

Village. Kuttikkol

Taluk. Chirakkal

District. Malabar

Date of Arri. 5.3.92

Date of Receipt. 17.3.92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Six.

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against Dy. Comrs Order No 185 9.3.89.

Petr's father Gundakkan was the hereditary Thandiyan and Petr is the present Thandiyan and also of Dharmapattam Kuttikkol Nercheriamam Kottiyam Thandiyan Stanam & three villages was registered in the name of his Eldest son Gundakkan Shamanna who was performing the duties of the office at the time of making ac-

Arrangement for the performance of Patel dance, after enquiry into previous matters to be made by Corporal Patel and Police Constable Gabriel Perera, and Police Sergeant Patel of Nawalapitiya. In the event of the aforesaid Podda Nilame, the Kuruwe three brothers officiating a Devale annual festivals it is proposed to perform with deputations to be elected, keeping out the following arrangements be made:—

1. The Standing of the Corps Village of Pankure registered in the name of Senior Nawalapitiya Corporal Podda Nilame.

2. The Patel of Pankure in the name of Nawalapitiya Corporal Gabriel Perera (Grandfather)

3. The Patel of Nawalapitiya Kalli in the name of Nawalapitiya Corporal Gabriel Perera

4. The Standing of the Magistrate Kalli in Nawalapitiya forming one circle

in the name of Ct. D
Thurston the Guilder
in his report No. 8, of Jan
the 8th praying for an
order of Prospect
of Ct Passapuram Talu
mandal of Guntur Dis
trict and Ramayya
the Dy: Commr has re-
ported in favour of
Lakshmi Narasayya as
Shanbogue of the Village,
in accordance with the pray
of Shamanna in favour
of Lakshmi.

The deposition of
the said Lakshmi Nar-
asayya, who is not a minor
was not taken into consideration
by the Dy: Commr. Petitioner
Petitioner was then called
upon on 6th August 1900 and
Nonplus, complaining
against the appointment
of Lakshmi Narasayya
as Shanbogue of the vil-
lage, but no explanation
received

Ketamma, in support
of the petition put up,
can be informed
that the enquiry
direct, consistent, the
name of the petitioner should
be rejected.

—x—

Therefore, Petr. [illegible] happa presented himself before the Amildar, on 4th 2. 62 and [illegible] ('etc) was informed that as the former Dy: Commr. had disposed of the case, it cd not be re-opened & that if necessary, he might appeal.

In conclusion, Petr. prays that the case be decided in accordance with the depositions & Amildar's report.

Dy: Commr's hukum No 685 of 9. 8. 39 to the Amildar. —

As it appears from the records that the Shanboga of the 2 villages in question had been registered in the name of the deceased Shanmanna ~~Therefore~~, his [illegible] [illegible] Lakshmi Narnappa's name shd be now registered and work shd be taken from him: Shamanna's widow

R. 18 2.
No 45 Draft issued 17/3

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE, 17/3

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 4295
dated 16th March 92 received at the
Dewan's Office from Devaraja, Settler
of Shigavanna, Regis Lender
Shanbogue of Kenkere,
Gowdru Dasaru, complaining
of the abandonment of Lakshmi
Narasaiah as Shanbogue of
Kenkere & 2 Nen villages
is forwarded, together with its Six
enclosures, to the Deputy Commr
Kolar Dist. with a request
that he will report whether
the allegations made by the
petitioner in para 4 of his
petition are true & correct

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
17 March 1892

1892

15

No. 884

Petition praying that
letters of Probate of the Will of
Caroline Goldsmith
may issue to her.

D/ 29 — 8 — 92

Read — 3 — 9 — 92

Encls: Nil

Petitioner this
appeared on 16 - 3 - 92
requesting his Petition
be —

SRR
7/9/92.

Jno Wyllie Esq
Comptr
RO
re
16/9/92

Pet
407

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 584
dated 23-8-92 received at the
Dewan's Office from Devaraja, Goutha
of Shanbog Thamanna of
Kankere, Coorlidrum Taluk,
regarding his Shanbogui
work,

is forwarded, together with its
enclosures, to the Deputy Commr
Kolar Distt in county of
Hon'ble Mysore memo No 45 dt 17
May/92.

By Order,

24 September 1892 | Chief Secretary.

Endd issued
24/9/92

Petition
Receipt 11 VII 92

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

From The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 14th October 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & 1 Enc

General No. 1245
No. 275

~~In reply to~~

SUBJECT.

Mr Official Memoranda Nos. 45 and 207 dated the 11th May and 21st September 1892 respectively forwarding for report 2 petitions from Devappa brother of Channanna, Registered Manager of Konkere, Gowdahalli Taluk.

Herewith returned with the enclosures.

Observe that the Sub-Dn Officer's letter referred to does not give the required information & request the Dy Comr to obtain the reply & the following queries -

1 The Petr in the last para of his petn addressed to this office states that he petitioned the Dy Comr on 16.3.89, 4.8.90 & 8.11.91. Were

Writ

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the case No. 3592/26, dated 1892

L2

With reference to the above I have the honour to submit herewith copy of the Chief Collector's Civil Office letter No. 2198 of the 11th ultimo explaining the circumstances of the case.

2. The Original records bearing on the subject as per accompanying Index are also submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

X Were 3 petitions received in the Dy Comrs Office or not? If received how were they disposed of & Was no reply given to the Petnrs?

(2) Was the petitioner told personally by the Dy Comr. or the Asst Dy Comr when the petnr received his representation not to interfere with the order passed by his predecessor & that the petnr might appeal against the order complained against?

(3) What became of Venkatachikkanna's petition referred to in Mr. Rykens's Memo. dated 9.3.85, No. 685?

No petition should be entertained unless it complies with the above rules

Dy Comr
3/85

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. IN 4295
DATE 17-3-92

Two Rupees Adhesive Stamps affixed

27.5.92

Subhash Kumar

584 R
3-9-72

(General Serial No. 30)

26 Diwan

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

Dated 6th

Despatched Dec. 1892.

Received

Enclosures No. 2 of 16 Folios

General No. 7892
Pol No. 736-92

Calling for particulars in connection with the petition of Narayana of Kere, Gauribidanur Taluk.

References to be marked.

From the same No. 1631-3/17-3-93

From the same No. 1780/200 3/31-3-93

To

The Deputy Minister,

Fisheries Department,

Ottawa.

275

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, enclosing petition of Fishermen, Grindstone Island,

---

With reference to the above I beg to state that I have not received to date any reply to my letter of the 15th ult. requesting information on the following queries:—

1) Did the petitioners in the accompanying petition addressed to this office, state that the petitioned the Dy. Comm. on the 3rd, 4th, 5th & 7th inst.

Were these petitions received in the Dy. Comm's office or not? If received how were they disposed of? Was no reply given to the Petitioners?

2) Was the petitioner told personally by the Dy. Comm. on the 4th inst., or was the

16

petitioner required his re-
-presentations, that he
(By Comm.) would not interfere with the order passed
by his predecessor, that the
Petitioner might appeal
against the order complained
of?

(3) If not become infructuous
& the said petition re-
ferred to in the By Comm's
order dt 9.5.89, be disposed?

2. The papers should be re-
-submitted at an early
date with complete answers
to the above queries,

By Order
draft. Mrk
6/12
Jt. Chief Secretary.

W. K

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893. 3013.

P. 132.

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar district

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 31st August 1893

Despatched 1-9-93

Received

Enclosures No. 3 Papers.

General No. 780

No. 200

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the appeal petition of Dasarihalli Gowdre — — —

In pursuance of an amicable settlement effected between Rao Bahadur & his Co-Sharers, the Petitioners the Shanbhogs of Narsimmanahalli & Dinamagatahalli which form one charge.

The Deputy Commissioner did not recognise that arrangement and on 9th March 1892 passed the order in favour of Lakkaminarasappa son of the last holder Shamanna, though the arrangement had been confirmed & the decree of Shamanna's Court in Lakkaminarasappa had conferred on him the Shanbhogi of another village, Hemdere. Dasarihalli appealed against this order.

The Sub-Dy Commr states that "Dasarihalli contention is to all sound... It would have ceased all future dispute if the arrangement which the parties had arrived at among themselves had been confirmed."

A Revenue Appeal was filed about 3 years after the date of the Deputy Commr's order. A reference was made to the Deputy Commr regarding the Petrs explanation why that no answer was given to the petition addressed to him & that he was at last told verbally that the late Deputy Commr's order could not be interfered with. This letter contains the Deputy Commr's observations on this point.

The Deputy Commr says that the fact that Petr obtained a copy of

Petition Received 2/9/93

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

20

It is said Petitioner with in Feb. 30 & yet failed to present his appeal in time

After obtaining the Order the Petr Narayan presented 3 petitions to the Dist. but they are all signed & have been withdrawn - It is seen from the Petn that Petr Narayan Pillai & Ramayyan among all Co-sharers -

Under the circumstances referred to above, the appeal may be admitted & notice issued to Petr and Kattamuthu Pillai

Sd/-

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

No. 750/200 Con 3 V, Police. Kolar District,

Dated 31 August 1893.
1-9-93

To

The Chief Secretary to the (1)
L. D. B. Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No. 7892 dated 6th December 892, calling for further report in regard to the appeal petition of Devappa of Kurlere, Gowdadore Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith for information a list showing the petitions received at this office from the petitioner and the action taken on each of them.

2. It will be observed from the same that out of 6 petitions herein mentioned one rejected to the Sub-Division Officer, Chickballapur, for disposal and handed to the Amildar of Gowdadore for report and returned by him to this office three in number and they do not seem to have any important bearing on the point at issue by the object of the enquiry made by your docket under reply is to ascertain whether or not the petitioner slept over his right of appeal and whether the appeal presented by him to Government 3 years after the Order appealed against was passed by my

produced by Hafiz Abdul Rahman to arrive.

3. The remaining petitions and the connected papers, together with the records received with your docket index acknowledgment are herewith submitted as per list attached thereto. The Miscellaneous annual petition called for by you have been filed with the enclosed proceedings.

4. It is clear that a copy of the order appealed against was delivered to the petitioner on the 6th February 1890 or upwards of 2 years prior to the presentation of this appeal to Government, though he has evidently been at no pains of gaining time, refrained from referring to it in, or producing it with, his appeal petition into which he has put another copy of the order subsequently obtained by him in February 1892.

5. Two appeal petitions received with your official memoranda noted in the margin are herewith returned.

6. At the distance of time I cannot with any amount of certainty state whether the petitioner was, or a personal representation did to appeal to Government and could not intervene with any

No. 1 dated 18th July 1893.
No. 2 & 6 dated 9th August 1893.

predecessors order; however it seems to me that the Court cannot have made such a representation as that and I send herewith a copy of the order above referred to in February last with the express object of applying to Government to have a petition presented on the 11th April 1889 filed with the records.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

E. Mac Lean

Deputy Commissioner

Jesus

List showing the petitions received at the Kol
No Konkere, Yarikinar Taluk, and the re

Serial No.	Date of Petition	Regd. No.	Date of receipt	Substances	
1	April 893	—	10th April 889	Applying for the annulment of the Deputy Commissioner's order appointing Lakshmia-narnappa as Shanbogue of Konkere and other villages	Petit
2	Not given	12	— do —	Applying for a copy of the Deputy Commissioner's order appointing Lakshmia-narnappa as Shanbogue of Konkere and other villages together with a copy of the Amildar's report in the case.	After ... Amildar in ...missioner by the Peti Amildar f 16th Febru petitioner w
3	5th May 1889	54	8th May 1889	Praying for the early grant of the copies applied for in the above.	The Amil records a the paper
4	31st August 892	102	4th December 892	Stating that the petition regarding the Shanbogue ship of Konkere has not been disposed of.	These Hon. 52 and records an District offi in which he report No. 1 application to him in Ju quoted abo Could not
5	— do —	103	— do —	Praying that the Shan-bogue ship may be con-ferred on all the 3 hobli-dars.	Refe for disp Officer, Ko Office.
6	8th November 1893	110	10th November 893	Praying for the annul-ment of the order appoint-ing Lakshminarnappa as Shanbogue of Konkere &c.	

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office

Dated 28th August 1893

Deputy Commissioner's Office from date of
tion taken upon each of them. 34

Action taken on the petition	Remarks
... returned on the 16th April 1889 being unstamped.	
... correspondence between the District office and the ... order to get the records with which the Deputy Commissioner's order referred to had been filed the copy applied for ... Petitioner was prepared in this office and sent to the ... for delivery to the Petitioner who obtained it on the ... January 1890 and gave a receipt for the same, the ... was refused a copy of the Amildar's report.	
...ldar was ordered to expedite the transmission of the ... his reply No: 30 dated 27th May 1889 to the effect that ... had already been forwarded was filed in this office. ...etitions were sent to the Amildar with this office orders ...3 dated 11th September 1890 respectively for report with ... they seem to have eventually been returned to the ...e with the Amildar's Yerzi No: 23 dated 24th April 1891 ... referred to previous Correspondence ending with his ...5 dated 22nd February 1890 connected with the petitioner's ... for the copy of the Deputy Commissioner's order granted ...bruary 1889. The Amildar's Yerzi No: 23 dated 24th April 1891 ...e and its enclosures appear to have been mislaid. They ...be traced after a diligent search.	
...red to the Sub-Division officer, Chickballapur ...sal on the 19th December 1891. The Sub-Division ...orts that their petition was not received at his	

Nazaguddyapur

for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Peon

Before The Government
of H. H. The Maharaja
of Mysore.

(8)

L. R. 13 of Civil Suit No 202 of 1891-92

Appellant

Dasappa of
Kenkere,
Gowdaroone
Taluk, Kolar
Dist. represented
by Mr. L. Seenivasiengar
advocate

vs

Respondent

Lakshmi-
narasappa
represented by
Mr. Narayanaswamy
Advocate

Decision 24th February
1894.

Appellant and Respondent
are members of one family
related to each other as
shewn below



The family has Ummbalige
right in 3 villages and
Potaki right in 2 villages.
The Ummbalige stood
in the name of Respondent
and the Potaki in the

names of the Appellant
and Chellia Ramanna
On the death of Respondents
father, the parties agreed
among themselves in
January 1889 that the
Pieces should be distri-
buted as shewn below,
and applied for entry accordingly:-

		Present Patagé	
Appellant - Members of Dimmagatamalli & Chavakinhanahalli		48—0—0	
Respondent — do — of Kenkere —	5	4— 0	× Converted according to Survey Ch 1871 dated 20 581 of 3-3-96
Ramachendrappa - Patail of Kenkere		4 0—0	
Narasappa — do — of Dimmagatamalli	1	2 81/14	×

But the Deputy Com-
missioner issued an order
on 9th March 1889, that the
Shanbhogi right of all
the Villages should be in
the name of the Respondent,
and that the Patail Offices
should remain as they
were. The Deputy

Commissioner has not
given his reasons for
not complying with the
request of the parties,
but from the records
it appears that Respondent
mother presented a petition
to the Deputy Commissioner
on 7th March, stating
that the Shambhogi right
of Narasimhanthalli
was acquired by her
husband, and that the
Shambhogi right of all
the villages should be
registered in the name
of herself and her
second son. Probably
the Deputy Commissioner
did not wish to go
into the matter and
simply gave the order
he passed. The Respondent

is unable to show that he has exclusive right to any of the offices nor that he was not aware of it when he gave his consent. Government therefore direct that the offices be registered in the names of the several parties according to their settlement in 1889. If Respondent's brother has any claim he may assert it in due course.

By order

Registrar

[illegible] for Chief Secretary

Copies to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar District with the records returned with his no. 1205/275 dated 31 October 1892

By order

for Chief Secretary

12 2 10/3

No. 5847 4235 as 202-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
15 February 1894

Endorsement granted to Dasappa of Kenkere Gowdanahalli, Kolar Dist represented by Mr L. Seetharamaiyengar advocate

in reply to his - Petition Registered No. 5847 4235 as 202 dated 24th August 1893 claiming the Inamdhoji regarding his Inam for Kenkere & the other villages of Dimmajattanahalli and Kurumanahalli

Petitioner is informed that reference is to the Inam Commissioner to whom orders have been issued granting the appeal petitioner requested.

Mr Seetharamaiyengar informed

Redmpt.

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000